REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested. Claims 1-38 and 42-50 are pending. Claims 39-41 are canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, Claims 1, 21, 22, 30, 37, and 38 are amended, and new Claims 42-50 are added by way of the present amendment. As amended Claims 1, 21, 22, 30, 37, and 38 and new Claims 42-50 are supported by the original claims and specification, no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 37 was objected to; and Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21-40 were rejected as anticipated by <u>Lurcott et al.</u> (International Patent Application Publication No. WO 03/04882, hereinafter "<u>Lurcott</u>"); Claims 2, 4, 19, 20, and 41 were rejected as unpatentable over <u>Lurcott</u>; and Claims 7, 11, 13, 14, and 17 were rejected as unpatentable over <u>Lurcott</u> in view of <u>Schlabach et al.</u> (U.S. Patent No. 6,810,406, hereinafter "<u>Schlabach</u>").

Initially, applicants and applicants' representatives thank Primary Examiner Jarrett for the interview held on June 1, 2006 to discuss the present case. During the interview, differences between the claimed invention and <u>Lurcott</u> and <u>Schlabach</u> were discussed in detail, and amendments as submitted herein were discussed to clarify the discussed differences. The Examiner agreed to reconsider the rejection of record after formal submission of the present amendment.

With regard to the objection to Claim 37, Claim 37 is amended to be in independent form. Accordingly, the objection to Claim 37 is believed to be overcome.

With regard to the rejection of Claim 1 as anticipated by <u>Lurcott</u>, that rejection is respectfully traversed.

¹See, e.g., the Specification at paragraphs 90 and 115-117 and Figures 3A, 3F, 8E, 14A, 14B, and 18A.

Amended Claim 1 recites in part:

a service action system coupled to said data collection system and said data storage system, and configured to provide service action data using said service activity data by performing a plurality of service functions comprising at least providing service component repair for a semiconductor manufacturing component, providing service component startup for a semiconductor manufacturing component, providing service component preventative maintenance for a semiconductor manufacturing component, providing service component cleaning for a semiconductor manufacturing component, providing service component revisions for a semiconductor manufacturing component, providing service component enhancements for a semiconductor manufacturing component, providing service component de-installation for a semiconductor manufacturing component, providing service education for a semiconductor manufacturing component, and providing service collaboration for a semiconductor manufacturing component,

wherein a graphical user interface of the service action system includes a single menu screen allowing user access to *all service functions* performed by the service action system. (Emphasis added.)

Lurcott broadly describes a method and apparatus for monitoring, control, and analysis of independent systems in a manufacturing facility. Although Lurcott describes some service functions of manufacturing equipment, it is respectfully submitted that Lurcott does not teach each and every one of the service functions recited in Claim 1. Further, although Lurcott broadly describes the use of a web based application, Lurcott does not teach or suggest "a graphical user interface of the service action system includes a single menu screen allowing user access to all service functions performed by the service action system." In fact, Lurcott does not provide any screen shots of any kind showing the web based application described by Lurcott, nor are there any descriptions of the display of the web based application. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Lurcott does not teach or suggest "a service action system" as recited in amended Claim 1. Consequently, Claim 1 (and Claims 2-20 and 42-50 dependent therefrom) is patentable over Lurcott.

²See Lurcott, page 3, lines 28-32 and page 6, lines 10-14

Amended Claims 21, 22, 30, 37, and 38 also recite similar elements to Claim 1. Consequently, Claims 21, 22, 30, 37, and 38 (and Claims 23-29 and 31-36 dependent therefrom) are also patentable over <u>Lurcott</u>.

With regard to the rejection of Claims 7, 11, 13, 14, and 17 as unpatentable over <u>Lurcott</u> in view of <u>Schlabach</u>, it is noted that Claims 7, 11, 13, 14, and 17 are dependent from Claim 1, and thus are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons discussed above. Further, it is respectfully submitted that <u>Schlabach</u> does not cure any of the above-noted deficiencies of <u>Lurcott</u>. For example, <u>Schlabach</u> also fails to teach or suggest "a graphical user interface of the service action system includes a single menu screen allowing user access to *all service functions* performed by the service action system." Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 7, 11, 13, 14, and 17 are patentable over <u>Lurcott</u> in view of <u>Schlabach</u>.

New Claims 42-50 are supported at lest by the specification at paragraphs 90 and 115-117 and Figures 3A, 3F, 8E, 14A, 14B, and 18A. As new Claims 42-50 depend from Claim 1, Claims 42-50 are believed to be patentable for at least the reasons described above with respect to Claim 1. In addition, Claims 42-50 are believed to recite subject matter that further defines over Lurcott. Claims 42-50 recite further details of the graphical user interface of the invention recited in Claim 1. As noted above, Lurcott does not provide any details of the web based application described by Lurcott. Accordingly, Claims 42-50 further define over Lurcott.

Application No. 10/799,892 Reply to Office Action of March 27, 2006

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the foregoing comments, it is respectfully submitted that the invention defined by Claims 1-38 and 42-50 patentably distinguishes over the cited art. The present application is therefore believed to be in condition for formal allowance and an early and favorable reconsideration of this application is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Customer Number 22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 06/04)

I:\ATTY\ET\250049US\250049US-AMD6.27.06.DOC

Steven P. Weihrouch Attorney of Record

Registration No. 32,829

Edward Tracy Registration No. 47,998